



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST-NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/329,606 | 06/10/1999 | ANDREW F. ROBERTS | 10012.911 | 8318 |

23600 7590 06/24/2002

COUDERT BROTHERS LLP
333 SOUTH HOPE STREET
23RD FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071

EXAMINER

PRIETO, BEATRIZ

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2152

DATE MAILED: 06/24/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/329,606

Applicant(s)

ROBERTS ET AL.

Examiner

B. PRIETO

Art Unit

2152

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 April 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. **DRAFT PERSON**
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Drawings filed 04/05/02 have been approved to by the Draftsperson.
2. Quotation of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action may be found in previous office action.
3. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneck et. al. (Schneck) U.S. Patent No. 6,260,039 in further view of Perkowski U.S. Patent No. 5,918,214.

Regarding claims 1 and 11, Schneck teaches substantial features of the invention as claimed. Schneck teaches a system/method comprising:

storing identifiers of a plurality of services (col 4/lines 23-33, 43-63, col 3/lines 37-38) in a (104) directory (col 3/lines 37-38);

an computer (102) (engine, i.e. processor) receiving request (col 3/lines 54-56, col 4/lines 48-52, 53-56) to access said plurality of services;

a plurality of drivers means for handling request and responses to/from said plurality of services (i.e. drivers for interfacing with said plurality of services) (col 3/lines 28-33, col 4/lines 10-14, interfacing with services, col 4/line 10-14) and with said engine via a plurality of drivers based on said requests (col 4/lines 23-3, 42-65 request data);

said services comprising a plurality of service providers accessible to said plurality of drivers for providing services identified (e.g. names) in said directory (col 5/lines 33-67, service entities using directory entries, col 5/lines 62-67);

however Schneck teachings of a directory of identifiers to a plurality of services, does not explicitly teach using said identifiers to access said services;

Perkowski teaches a plurality of directories (IPSD (3) of Fig. 1) (col 6/lines 27-33) containing a plurality of identifiers to a plurality of services (col 3/lines 22-41, identifiers, col 8/lines 46-col 9/line 35); and using said identifiers to direct

~~request to access said services when requested (requests col 3/lines 52-60, Fig. 3B, col 5/lines 28-31, access using said identifiers, Fig. 4B, upon request Fig. 4A, receiving request, col 7/lines 5-6, 10-12, directory including identifiers to a plurality of services and including metadata, col 8/lines 46-col 9/line 35);~~

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to implement to claimed directory, using a database for storing a plurality of services information, to implement claimed engine, using a computer processor for receiving request for accessing a plurality of services including any resource accessible of a client/server (request-response) architecture, to implement claim drivers, using an processor and executable instructions for processing the request and responses between said services and said engine and provide access to said services. These elements providing the same functionality as claimed elements, motivation would be to enable the access to a wide variety of services resources comprising multi-sourced content and further customize build responses, as suggested by Schneck. Further to utilize Perkowski's teaching to use identifiers obtained from different directories to access said services upon request or automatically, as taught by Perkowski, motivation would be use standard-base directory interface to unify disparate directories, as suggested by Schneck.

Regarding claims 2-3, the above teachings further teach wherein said directory includes metadata descriptive information, i.e. metadata (Schneck: col 3/lines 57-60) for each of said plurality of services in said directory (Schneck: col 5/lines 36-37, 41-49); wherein said metadata defines a schema comprises input/output data (e.g. data format (html) or HTTP parameters) (Schneck: col 4/lines 23-33, 42-65).

Regarding claims 4-5, the above teachings further teach wherein said metadata further includes definition, invocation or commands data, i.e. configuration parameters for defining, invoking, or commanding, i.e. configuring a specific driver (Schneck: col 5/lines 26-32, object class) associated with said service (Schneck: col

~~5/lines 1-11, col 6/lines 1-6); and wherein said services are accessible via an API~~
(Schneck: col 4/lines 10-14).

4. Claims 6-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneck et. al. (Schneck) U.S. Patent No. 6,260,039 in view of Call U.S. Patent No. 6,154,738.

Regarding claim 6, the above teachings however do not explicitly teach wherein said services are XML-based services;

Call teaches a directory of a plurality of services means for receiving request to access said services and means for providing said services using data in said directory identifying services, wherein said services are XML-based services (col 9/lines 66-col 23/line 49).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include XML based services, motivation would be enabling enhance the rendered services wherein the selection and rendering of the product information services is controlled by the links specified by service provider providing dynamic data controlled by the style specification which may have different visual styles, as suggested by Call.

Regarding claims 7-8, service provider comprises an entity that is capable of receiving some information and providing a response (Schneck: col 4/lines 15-21); wherein said engine interprets said requests and determines what services are needed to fulfill request, directs requests to the appropriate services via said service drivers (Schneck: col 7/lines 8-14, col 5/lines 62-67), and builds responses into replies (Schneck: col 7/lines 18-32, col 6/lines 1-6).

Regarding claims 9-10 the above teachings further teach wherein said requests comprise HTTP requests (Schneck: col 4/lines 23-33); wherein access to said system is accomplished via a web (108) browser (Schneck: col 3/lines 24-41).

~~Regarding claims 12-20, these claims comprise the method associated with the~~
system disclosed on claims 2-10, respectively same rationale is applicable.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Prieto, B.** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-0750**. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 to 3:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, **Mark H. Rinehart** can be reached on **(703) 305-4815**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **(703) 308-6606**. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is **(703) 305-3800/4700**.

Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Box AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7238, (for Official After-final communications; please mark
"EXPEDITED PROCEDURE", for other Official communications; (703)
746-7239)

Or:

(703) 465-7240 (for Non-Official, Draft communications, status query,
please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal
Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).



B. Prieto

Patent Examiner

June 22, 2002

MEHMET B. GECKIL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

